

1
2
3 Honorable Richard A. Jones
4
5
6
7
8

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

9
10
11
12
13
14

SEATTLE MIDEAST AWARENESS)	
CAMPAIGN, a Washington non-profit)	
corporation,)	No. 2:11-cv-00094-RAJ
)	
	Plaintiff,)	KING COUNTY'S BRIEF IN
)	OPPOSITION TO SEATTLE
vs.)	MIDEAST AWARENESS
)	CAMPAIGN'S MOTION FOR
KING COUNTY, a municipal corporation,)	RELIEF FROM DEADLINE
)	
	Defendant.)	<i>Noted for February 4, 2011</i>
)	

15 I. **RELIEF REQUESTED**

16 This motion is being heard because Plaintiff has demanded premature and burdensome
17 depositions while Defendant King County is busy responding to Plaintiff Seattle Middle East
18 Awareness Campaign's (SeaMAC's) motion for preliminary injunction and before the parties
19 have conferred as required by Fed.R.Civ.P. 26(f). King County respectfully requests that this
20 Court deny SeaMAC's motion for relief from deadline. Plaintiff's request to conduct discovery
21 during the week of February 7, 2011 should be denied in accordance to Fed.R.Civ.P. 26(d) and
22 30(a)(2)(A)(iii). Also, Plaintiff fails to establish good cause for the request, which creates a
23 substantial burden on Defendant.

KING COUNTY'S BRIEF IN OPPOSITION TO SEATTLE
MIDEAST AWARENESS CAMPAIGN'S MOTION FOR
RELIEF FROM DEADLINE - 1 (11-00094 RAJ)

Daniel T. Satterberg, Prosecuting Attorney
CIVIL DIVISION, Litigation Section
900 King County Administration Building
500 Fourth Avenue
Seattle, Washington 98104
(206) 296-8820 Fax (206) 296-8819

II. STATEMENT OF FACTS

SeaMac filed its Complaint for Declaratory and Injunctive Relief and its Motion for Preliminary Injunction on January 19, 2011 [Dkt. 1-2] Plaintiff initially noted the Preliminary Injunction Motion for February 4, 2011, but re-noted it for February 11, 2011 [Dkt. 5] when defense counsel pointed out that LCR 7(d)(3) requires noting the motion four Fridays after filing. Declaration of Endel R. Kolde ("Kolde Decl.") at ¶2.

By minute order [Dkt. 7], dated January 24, 2011, the deadline for the parties' Rule 26(f) conference is February 23, 2011, and it is undisputed that this conference has not yet taken place. Kolde Dec. at ¶3. Pursuant to LCR 7(d)(3), King County's papers in opposition to SeaMAC's Preliminary Injunction Motion are due on February 7, 2011. Oral argument on Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Injunction has been scheduled for March 2, 2011.

In a brief telephone conversation on January 19, 2011, Defense counsel acknowledged the lawsuit and Plaintiff's counsel asked about the procedure for acceptance of service. Kolde Dec. at ¶2. During that conversation, Plaintiff's counsel also indicated that SeaMAC did not plan to seek early discovery, but that it might change *after* King County's response was filed, which is due February 7, 2011. *Id.* at ¶¶2-3. On, Tuesday, January 25, 2011, Plaintiff's counsel reversed course and sent an email requesting early depositions. *Id.*, Ex. A. Defense counsel indicated that he would respond the next day or Thursday. *Id.* On the next day, January 26, 2011, Plaintiff's counsel emailed a draft joint status report, even though the parties had not had their Rule 26(f) conference. *Id.*, Ex. B.

At 10:30 a.m. on Thursday, January 27, 2010, Defense counsel emailed a response indicating that Defense counsel was busy responding to SeaMAC's motion and that we were not planning to have the Rule 26(f) conference until after the all the briefing on the preliminary

1 injunction motion was filed. *Id.*, Ex. B. Defense counsel also requested an explanation for the
 2 change of course on early discovery. *Id.* That afternoon, at 2:01 p.m., Plaintiff's counsel left
 3 Defense counsel Endel Kolde a voicemail asking to discuss SeaMAC's request for oral argument
 4 and request for early depositions. *Id.* at ¶6. At no point in the voice message (which the
 5 undersigned has saved) does Plaintiff's counsel set a deadline or indicate that this motion for
 6 relief would be forthcoming.¹ *Id.* Plaintiff's counsel sent another email at 2:23 p.m. which
 7 mentioned the possibility of a motion, but did not set a deadline. *Id.*, Ex. C.

8 Nevertheless, at approximately 5:04 p.m that same, SeaMAC filed its Motion for Relief
 9 from Deadline [Dkt. 8 & 9], just as Defense counsel was working on a reply email. Kolde Dec.
 10 at ¶8, Ex. D. That email was sent at 5:08 p.m. *Id.*, Ex. D.

11 The next day, on January 28, 2011, without prior notice, Plaintiff also noted two
 12 depositions. Kolde Dec., ¶¶9-10, Exs. E, F. The first deposition, noted for Februy 7, 2011, is a
 13 30(b)(6) deposition, which would require multiple deponents and would likely take the entire
 14 day, if not longer. Kolde Dec., Ex. E. This deposition is also noted for the day King County's
 15 response briefing is due on the underlying preliminary injunction motion. The second deposition
 16 notice directs King County Executive Dow Constantine to appear on February 8, 2011. *Id.*, Ex.
 17 F. Both notices also include extensive requests for the production of documents at the
 18 depositions, which were noted for a mere ten to eleven calendar days later, respectively. *Id.*, Exs.
 19 E, F. It is undisputed that Plaintiff had not received leave of the Court prior to noting these
 20 depositions and prior to the Parties conducting their Fed.R.Civ.P. 26(f) conference. *Id.* at ¶3; *see*
 21 also Plaintiff SeaMAC's Motion For Relief From Deadline [Dkt. 8] at 2:11-19.

22
 23 ¹ As a result, Plaintiff's counsel declaration that he "left a message--advising that a Motion for Relief from Deadline
 may be necessary[,"] is mistaken. King County defers to the Court as to whether the requirements of LCR
 37(a)(1)(A) have been met by counsel for SeaMAC.

1 On January 31, 2011, at the request of Defense counsel, the parties conducted a LCR
 2 26(c)(1) telephone conference to discuss the deposition notices and King County's stated intent to
 3 file a motion for a protective order. Kolde Dec. at ¶14. Defense counsel requested that the
 4 deposition notices be withdrawn. *Id.* Plaintiff's counsel requested that the depositions be
 5 scheduled by agreement for later in February but did not agree to withdraw the depositions
 6 notices. *Id.* The parties were not able to reach an agreement and this response brief and King
 7 County's Motion for Protective Order ensued. *Id.*

8 **III. EVIDENCE RELIED UPON**

9 1. Declaration of Endel R. Kolde In Support of King County's Brief in Opposition to
 10 Seattle Mideast Awareness Campaign's Motion For Relief From Deadline and the attachments
 11 thereto.

12 **IV. ARGUMENT**

13 **1. SeaMAC's Premature Deposition Notices Are Unreasonable and Violate 14 Fed.R.Civ.P. 26(d) and 30(a)(2)(A)(iii)**

15 It is undisputed that the parties have not had their Rule 26(f) conference. Kolde Dec. at
 16 ¶3. As such, the hold on discovery under Rule 26(d) applies, absent agreement or court order.
 17 "A party may not seek discovery from any source before the parties have conferred as required by
 18 Rule 26(f)." Similarly, Rule 30(a)(2)(A)(iii) requires that SeaMAC obtain leave of the Court
 19 since it seeks to "take the deposition before the time specified in Rule 26(d)[.]" Absent
 20 permission from this Court, SeaMAC's premature deposition notices are "defective and
 21 unenforceable." *Keller v. Edwards*, 206 F.R.D. 412, 415 (D.Md. 2002). Thus, as matters stand
 22 currently, the early depositions noted by SeaMAC do not comport with the court rules.
 23

1 Moreover, SeaMAC has failed to give reasonable notice for the depositions under Rule
 2 30(b)(1). The notices include a wide-ranging Rule 30(b)(6) deposition notice and a notice to the
 3 top elected official in King County government. Kolde Dec., Exs. E, F. Accordingly, on this
 4 date, defendant King County is filing its own Motion for Protective Order, concurrent with this
 5 response.

6 **2. SeaMAC has Failed to Show Good Cause for Early Discovery**

7 Plaintiff's motion is based on the bald assertion that expedited discovery is necessary
 8 because SeaMAC is seeking a preliminary injunction. Plaintiff's motion is unreasonable and
 9 should be denied.

10 It is axiomatic that, pursuant to Rule 26(d), formal discovery does not commence until
 11 after the parties have conferred as required by Rule 26(f). *In re Countrywide Fin. Corp*
 12 *Derivative Litig.*, 542 F.Supp.2d 1160, 1179 (C.D.Cal.2008). "However, courts may permit
 13 expedited discovery before the Rule 26(f) conference upon a showing of good cause." *Id.* Good
 14 cause exists "'where the need for expedited discovery, in consideration of the administration of
 15 justice, outweighs the prejudice to the responding party." *Id.* But expedited discovery is not
 16 automatically granted simply because a party is seeking injunctive relief. *American Legalnet,*
 17 *Inc. v. Davis*, 673 F.Supp.2d 1063, 1066(C.D.Cal.2009). Rather, such a request should be
 18 examined based "on the entirety of the record to date and the reasonableness of the request in
 19 light of all the circumstances. . ." *Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith*, 194 F.R.D. 618, 624
 20 (N.D.Ill.2000).

21 In determining the reasonableness of expedited discovery when a preliminary injunction
 22 is pending, the following non-exclusive factors are considered: "the breadth of the discovery
 23 requests; the purpose for requesting the expedited discovery; the burden on the defendants to

1 comply with the requests; and how far in advance of the typical discover process the request was
 2 made." *Disability Rights Council of Greater Wash.*, 234 F.R.D. 4, 6 (D.D.C.2006). In addition,
 3 the court always has the discretion to deny "excessive and burdensome discovery." *Qwest*
 4 *Commc'ns Int'l, Inc v. WorldQuest Networks, Inc.*, 213 F.R.D. 418, 419 (D.Colo.2003).

5 Here, Plaintiff offers no basis for its request other than to learn more about the nature of
 6 King County's defenses. *See* Plaintiff SeaMAC's Motion For Relief From Deadline [Dkt. 8] at
 7 3:16-21. The sole purpose of a preliminary injunction is to preserve the *status quo* pending a
 8 determination of the action on the merits. *Sierra Forest Legacy v. Rey*, 577 F.3d 1015, 1023 (9th
 9 Cir.2009). Plaintiff fails to make even a *prima facie* showing that the requested discovery is
 10 necessary to preserve the *status quo*; nor has plaintiff clarified the scope of its request by
 11 explaining how the topics on which it seeks to depose Executive Constantine and the objects of
 12 its Rule 30(b)(6) deposition relate to the pending preliminary injunction. Therefore, neither
 13 Defendant nor the Court can properly evaluate the reasonableness of Plaintiff's request.

14 Instead, it appears that Plaintiff is seeking the discovery of evidence relevant to a trial on
 15 the merits, without the benefit of an orderly, planned discovery process. But a preliminary
 16 injunction is not a substitute for a trial. *Cobell v. Norton*, 391 F.3d 251 261 (D.C.Cir. 2004). In
 17 addition, King County's witnesses and attorneys should have the benefit of adequate time to
 18 prepare for depositions that could be outcome-determinative in this case.

19 **3. Plaintiff's Request for Early Discovery is Burdensome and Would Prejudice
 20 King County**

21 Moreover, the Plaintiff's discovery request is burdensome and premature. Kolde Dec.
 22 ¶¶3, 11-12. First, Plaintiff has noted two depositions and both include requests for the production
 23 of documents. When a deposition notice joins a request for documents, Rule 34 procedures

1 apply. Under Rule 34, a minimum of 30-days notice is required. Fed.R.Civ.P. 34(b)(2)(A).
 2 Second, the 30(b)(6) deposition will require the coordination of multiple deponents and was
 3 noted for the same day that Defendant must file its papers in opposition to Plaintiff's Motion for
 4 Preliminary Injunction. Kolde Dec. at ¶2, Ex. E.

5 Defense Counsel for King County is presently working long hours in order to respond to
 6 SeaMAC's Motion for Preliminary Injunction. Kolde Dec. at ¶11. The undersigned counsel has
 7 been informed by one of the support staff working on this case that, to-date, King County has
 8 gathered 49,288 documents in response to this litigation. *Id.* at ¶12. These documents have only
 9 been de-duplicated within each custodian, not across all custodians. *Id.* More documents are still
 10 being gathered. *Id.* The number of documents above does not include internal King County
 11 communications, which are still being gathered. *Id.* A very small portion of the documents has
 12 been reviewed by counsel to-date. *Id.* To expect Defense Counsel to prepare its preliminary
 13 injunction response, gather and sift thousands of documents, while preparing numerous Rule
 14 30(b)(6) witnesses and the King County Executive for early depositions is unreasonable.

15 The Rule 26(f) conference exists in large part to ensure an orderly process for discovery.
 16 *See* Adv. Comm Notes on 1993 Amendments to Fed.R.Civ.P. 26(d) ("If deposition are held before
 17 the parties' initial meeting to develop a mutually cost-effective discovery plan, the cooperative
 18 effort at framing discovery could be frustrated.") Instead, King County is now put in the position
 19 of seeking protection from the Court due to SeaMAC's over-reaching demands.

20 **4. Plaintiff's Request for an Early Deposition of Executive Constantine is
 21 Unreasonable**

22 It is well-established that a party seeking to depose a high-ranking government official for
 23 taking official actions must provide compelling evidence that the official possesses information

1 essential to the case that is not obtainable from another source. *Kyle Engineering Co. v. Kleppe*,
 2 600 F.2d 226, 231-232 (9th Cir.1979); *see also, In re United States*, 197 F.3d 310, 313 (8th
 3 Cir.1999). In fact, heads of governments are not normally subject to deposition. *Kyle Engineering*
 4 *Co*, 600 F.2d at 232. This prevents the use of depositions for harassment purposes and protects
 5 such officials from the burdens of the discovery process. While King County is not objecting to
 6 discovery that is directed to the Executive, it is objecting to a testimonial deposition as the
 7 discovery vehicle. Instead, Defendant asks that Plaintiff seek discovery from the Executive in the
 8 form of interrogatories or a deposition by written questions. *Id.*; Fed.R.Civ.P. 31. In the
 9 alternative, King County objects to the unreasonably short notice that has been provided for this
 10 deposition of a high-ranking government official.

11 A determination of what constitutes reasonable notice for the deposition of a high ranking
 12 government official requires a consideration of the demands of such a deponent's position and the
 13 attendant scheduling constraints. Certainly, the notice of 6 business days (10 calendar days)
 14 provided here is unreasonable given the current posture of this case. At a minimum, Plaintiff
 15 should not have issued a deposition notice without consulting with Defense counsel about the
 16 convenience of specific dates.²

17 Accordingly, Defendant is also filing a motion for protective order, along with this
 18 response, asking the Court to order that the depositions not take place as noted.

19 V. CONCLUSION

20 For all of the reasons set forth above, Defendant respectfully asks that the Court deny
 21 Plaintiff's request to permit expedited discovery. Plaintiff proffered no justification for its request
 22 and it would be burdensome for Defendant to comply with such a discovery order, especially
 23

1 while preparing its opposition to Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Injunction, which is due on
2 February 7, 2011.

3 DATED this 2nd day of February, 2011 at Seattle, Washington.

4
5 DANIEL T. SATTERBERG
King County Prosecuting Attorney

6 By: /s/ Endel R. Kolde
7 ENDEL R. KOLDE, WSBA #25155
CYNTHIA GANNETT, WSBA #17152
JENNIFER RITCHIE, WSBA#24046
8 Senior Deputy Prosecuting Attorneys
Attorneys for Defendant
9 Email: Endel.Kolde@kingcounty.gov
Email: Cynthia.Gannett@kingcounty.gov
Email: Jennifer.Ritchie@kingcounty.gov
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 ² Defense counsel has also been informed that Executive Constantine is scheduled to be in Washington, D.C. from February 14-17, 2011. Kolde Dec. at ¶13.

CERTIFICATE OF FILING AND SERVICE

I hereby certify that on February 2, 2011, I electronically filed the foregoing document(s) with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system, which will send notification to the following plaintiff's attorneys:

*Jeffrey C. Grant, WSBA #11046
SKELLENGER BENDER, PS
Email: jgrant@skellengerbender.com*

Sarah A. Dunne, WSBA #34869
Lindsey S. Soffes, WSBA #41506
ACLU OF WASHINGTON FOUNDATION
Email: dunne@aclu-wa.org
Email: lsoffes@aclu-wa.org

DATED this 2nd day of February, 2011 at Seattle, Washington.

By: /s/ Liah Travis
LIAH TRAVIS
Paralegal, Litigation Section

KING COUNTY'S BRIEF IN OPPOSITION TO SEATTLE
MIDEAST AWARENESS CAMPAIGN'S MOTION FOR
RELIEF FROM DEADLINE - 10 (11-00094 RAJ)

Daniel T. Satterberg, Prosecuting Attorney
CIVIL DIVISION, Litigation Section
900 King County Administration Building
500 Fourth Avenue
Seattle, Washington 98104
(206) 296-8820 Fax (206) 296-8819